REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the application, and for indicating that claims 9, 10, 19, and 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has canceled claim 22 and has added new claims 23-25. Support for new claims 23-25 may be found throughout the specification, and the addition of new claims 23-25 does not constitute the addition of new matter. With the amendment, claims 1-21 and 23-25 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,832,298 to Sanchez et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,664,988 to Rollins.

Applicant's independent claim 1 requires, among other things, correlating the hardware configuration information of the at least one network component and the software configuration information of the software component graphic with network parameter information to form a correlation result representing an interoperability configuration of the software and the at least one network component; and outputting the correlation result to support automatic configuration of the at least one network component and the software for operation on the at least one network component. The Examiner cites to col. 8 lines 18-43, and to col. 4 lines 1-20 and again to col. 8 lines 18-43 of Sanchez et al. as teaching or suggesting these limitations.

However, neither in the cited sections nor elsewhere does Sanchez et al. teach or suggest correlating the hardware configuration information of the at least one network component and the software configuration information of the software component graphic with network parameter information to form a correlation result representing an interoperability configuration of the software and the at least one network component; and outputting the correlation result to support automatic configuration of the at least one network component and the software for operation on the at least one network component, as required by Applicant's independent claim 1. The cited sections of Sanchez et al. state as follows:

> The method includes the steps of interrogating the peripheral device for its current configuration and capabilities, receiving current configuration and current capabilities information from the peripheral device, generating, based on the received information, a graphical user interface which includes a representative graphical image of the peripheral device, displaying on a monitor the graphical user interface and the representative graphical image of the peripheral device which reflect the current configuration and the current capabilities of the peripheral device in accordance with the received information, displaying user-selectable job options based on the current configuration and current capabilities of the peripheral device, re-displaying, in response to a user selecting at least one user-selectable job option, the representative graphical image of the peripheral device set to perform at least one specific job option based on the at least one user-selectable job option selected by the user, and downloading the peripheral device job option data in accordance with the user-selectable job option selected. (col. 4 lines 1-20)
>
> One example of such a graphical user interface of digital copier 16 is shown in FIG. 5 which shows copier-configuration window 70 which includes representative graphical image 71 of digital copier 16. As mentioned above, graphical user interface 70 is generated based on the information returned from digital copier 16 regarding its current capabilities and current configuration. Specifically, copier UIDLL 65 retrieves specific copier configuration libraries and copier capabilities from libraries based on the returned configuration and capabilities information in order to generate a customized graphical user interface such as that shown in FIG. 5. That is, copier UIDLL 65 includes various libraries which include graphical display information and commands for each possible configuration and capabilities of digital copier 16. In this manner, upon receiving information from digital copier 16 regarding its current capabilities and current configuration, copier UIDLL 65 retrieves the configuration and capabilities based on that information and customizes a graphical user interface based on the current configuration and current capabilities of digital copier 16. It is to be understood that only configuration libraries and capabilities libraries which correspond to the returned current configuration and current capabilities of digital copier 16 are retrieved to create an appropriate graphical user interface. (col. 8 lines 18-43)

In other words, Sanchez et al. teaches a graphical user interface (GUI) that displays the current configuration of a network component (in this case, a printer), and provides a user, via that GUI, the ability to change the configuration of the network component according to available configuration options presented in the GUI. In contrast is Applicant's independent claim 1, which requires correlating the hardware configuration information of the at least one network component and the software configuration information of the software component graphic with network parameter information to form a correlation result representing an interoperability configuration of the software and the at least one network component. There is no such correlating taught by Sanchez et al. that forms a correlation result representing an interoperability configuration of the software and the at least one network component. Correlating, and the correlation result, are described in Applicant's specification at least at page 13 lines 3-10:

> By correlating or comparing the hardware configuration information 34, the software configuration information 38, and the known design rules to form the correlation result 42, the computerized device 22 performs a design check on the user-selected arrangement of the network components 28 and software application to detect (e.g., predict) if the selected software application (e.g., as represented by the software component graphic 36) works, or properly operates, on the selected configuration of the network components 28 (e.g., as represented by the network component graphic 32-1).

Correlating and the correlation result are also further described in Applicant's dependent claim 2. Applicant's dependent claim 2 requires, among other things, that correlating includes dynamically adjusting the hardware configuration information of the at least one network component **when the operability characteristic indicates inoperability of the software and the at least one network component** (emphasis added). Sanchez et al. never teaches or suggests that the software and the network component are inoperable, that is, cannot function together as configured.

Indeed, correlating and the correlation result that are required by Applicant's independent claim 1 are completely different from Sanchez et al. In Sanchez et al., the software being used with the hardware will certainly work; indeed, that is the very purpose of the software, to allow a user to alter the configuration of the hardware device, through a GUI; *see at least* Abstract and col. 1 line 58 to col. 2 line of Sanchez et al. It would be foolish for there to be any question of whether or not the software taught by Sanchez et al. would function with the hardware, and would defeat the stated purpose of Sanchez et al. In contrast, the question of interoperability is central to Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1, where the correlation result allows a user to know whether or not the selected at least one network component will work with selected software in a particular configuration.

Thus, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant's independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Sanchez et al., either alone or in combination with Rollins. Applicant's independent claim 1 is therefore not obvious in light of Sanchez et al., either alone or in combination with Rollins, and thus Applicant's independent claim 1 is thus allowable over Sanchez et al. in view of Rollins.

Applicant's independent claims 11, 21, and 22 all include limitations similar to those of Applicant's allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicant's allowable independent claim 1, Applicant's independent claims 11, 21, and 22 are themselves not obvious in light of Sanchez et al. in view of Rollins, and thus, Applicant's independent claims 11, 21, and 22 are allowable over the combination of Sanchez et al. with Rollins.

Applicant's dependent claims 2-8 and 12-18 depend from, respectively, Applicant's allowable independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicant's allowable independent claims 1 and 11, Applicant's dependent claims 2-8 and 12-18 are themselves not obvious in light of Sanchez et al. in view of Rollins, and thus, Applicant's dependent claims 2-8 and 12-18 are allowable over the combination of Sanchez et al. with Rollins.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests allowance of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-08(030122)

Dated: